# 28 OCTOBER 1946

## INDEX

Of

### WITNESSES

Prosecution's Witnesses						Page
	Liebert,	John Granville			(resumed)	8703
	Cross	11	Mr.	Furness FUJII USAMI Smith	(continued)	8703 8719 8737 8745

INDEX

of

EXHIBITS

(none)

### Monday, 28 October, 1946 INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL FOR THE FAR EAST Court House of the Tribunal War Ministry Building Tokyo, Japan 4 5 6 7 The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment, 8 at 0930. 9 10 11 12 Appearances: 13 For the Tribunal, same as before, with the 14 exception of the HONORABLE R. B. PAL, Member from 15 India, not sitting. 16 For the Prosecution Section, same as before. 17 For the Defense Section, same as before. 18 The Accused: 19 All present except OKAWA, Shumie and 20 MATSUI, Iwane who are represented by their 21 respective counsel. 22 23 (English to Japanese and Japanese 24 to English interpretation was made by the 25 Language Section, IMTFE.)

M 1 r & r

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session. THE PRESIDENT: Major Furness.

JOHN GRANVILLE LIEBERT, called as a witness on behalf of the prosecution, resumed the stand and testified as follows: CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)

#### BY MR. FURNESS:

Mr. Liebert, on Saturday I asked you to as-Q certain the value of the yen in 1931. Have you done so and if so what was it in terms of United States dollars?

I have before me a copy of the Financial and Economic Annual of Japan, 1940. This is printed by the government printing office under the suspices of the Department of Finance and I take it to be authoritative. At page 198, table 68, rates of foreign exchange, quotations from Yokohama Specie Bank, it is disclosed that in 1931 the value of the yen per hundred in San Francisco and New York was 49 3/8 per cent; that is, the yen was worth 49 3/8 cents.

Q And in November it was worth a little over 23 cents, I think you testified on Friday?

That is 1941.

1941. Have you any figures or data on the

rise in wholesale prices from 1931 to 1941?

A I have before me a chart of the retail prices from 1931 to 1939, which I think would be indicative of the information you desire.

Q What does that show?

A It shows that the retail price average in 1930, figuring Juhy, 1914, as the basis of a hundred, that the average retail price in 1930 was 155.1.

In 1931 it shows the average retail price was 135.5; in 1932, 136.8; in 1934, 148.7. It shows, I think, that the revaluation of the yen, about which we talked last Friday, was not reflected one hundred per cent in the retail prices, but rather the internal prices within Japan proper were not affected at all by such a change.

Q But undoubtedly it did affect the prices paid for purchases of goods in foreign countries, for which foreign exchange is necessarily used?

Yes, of course. That was the purpose of the revaluation measure.

Q And what does it show in later years?

A Well, of course, the average ratail price in later years paralleled the inflationary trends of the money. The retail prices rose accordingly. For instance, in 1939 the average retail price was 223.6.

ſ

Q Do you have anything on 1941?

A Not before me, but I know that the average retail price continued to spiral upwards as the inflationary trend progressed. That is normal.

Q And wholesale prices would follow the same trend, would they not?

A That is right.

Q So that in considering the expenditures of the government and all tables showing expenditures of yen in your report and testimony, we should consider that rise in the costs of the things paid for?

A That has been taken into consideration, Mr. Furness, because you will recall the charts and the figures in production which I have shown related to unit quantities, that is to say, tons or kiloliters, and I recall that in the comparative figures given for balances of trade it was accounted for in per cents rather than in over-all yen. And on the charts showing the percentage of investments of money in light industry as compared with heavy industry that was figured on the basis of money value in 1931 to avoid this discrepancy which might otherwise be latent.

Q But there are figures which just represent expenditures, such as the budgets and the raising of funds, which would not reflect it and, in considering

3

4 5

6

8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

17

(1)

18

20

21

23 24

25

these tables, we should take the rise in costs into consideration.

A Yes. The budget is expressed in terms of yen without any recalculation of comparative value of the yen, say, in 1941 and in 1931 or 1935. But the devaluation or revaluation of the yen had nothing to do with this increase in yen values. This was purely a result of the inflationary monetary trend within Japan.

Q But that inflationary trend, in itself, made it necessary to pay more for the same amount of goods in 1941 than it did in 1937 or in 1931?

A Yes, in terms of yen you would pay more for commodities in 1941 than you would in 1935.

Q I would like you to look at paragraph 146 of your report, page 116 of the English text. The figures in the lefthand column titled, "Total Budget," they refer to the annual budget of those particular fiscal years, do they not?

A That is correct.

Q And on that table the fiscal year 1940 shows a large proportionate rise in the total budget but a much lower proportionate rise in the war and navy budgets, is that correct?

A .Yes.

Q Now, you testified that you obtained your

3

6

5

8

9

11

13

15

16

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

figures -- that you inspected three sources of figurnes on these -- for your report on the budget. Could you tell us what those sources were?

A I got the three different -- I say, I got
three answers for the same figures from the Ministry
of Finance when I asked for the total budget for the
years indicated. There are many language difficulties
involved in getting exact information, as you can
imagine. The budgets, as were given to me, left out
certain elements which were desirable to have for lack
of understanding. I also got some figures from the
Demobilization Ministry with regard to the budget for
war expenditures, but they were not nearly complete.

Q Where did you get your final figures? How did you work them out?

A Final figures were given to me from the Ministry of Finance through the Central Liaison Office.

Q Lid you check them?

A Yes, I did.

Q Did you get your total War and Navy budgets from the same source?

A I got the war budget and the navy budget and totalled it myself.

Q So that your figures on the total budget, on the total war and navy budgets, do not come from the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

budget and the Nevy Ministry budget, from the papers supplied to you by the Finance Ministry?

A Yes.

Q I notice that those figures on the total budget come out to a figure, round figure, of a hundred thousand. The other figures, total war and navy budgets, come out to the yen. How do you account for that?

I make no effort to account for it.

Now, does the lefthand figure include expenditures from reserves and special accounts which are not included in the annual budget?

A My understanding is that this budget, expressed as total budget, is the budget appropriations for the fiscal year indicated.

22 23 24

Luda & Barton

Q But under the Japanese system of finance, are there not many special and reserve accounts which are not annually appropriated under the budget?

THE PRESIDENT: That is a common feature of all countries.

MR. FURNESS: What I am trying to show, sir, is that the figure, total budget, does not represent the total amount of money subject to expenditure during the fiscal year, whereas the figures in the right-hand column probably arg.

THE PRESIDENT: As a point of information,
Major Furness, I would like to know why you are stressing or trying to stress the fact that the figures were
not obtained from the same source and why they should
be less reliable if they were not. I say that in
no challenging way, but just to get information.

MR. FURNESS: Because in his report he refers to proportionate expenses, proportioning the war and navy expenditures and budgets to a total budget.

THE PRESIDENT: He appears to have taken total figures. He would not know how they were made up, would he? I did not understand him to say that he does, so, really, any cross-examination directed along these lines would not be very helpful.

wer to my question as to whether this total budget does include expenditures from reserve or special funds accounts not under the budget.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, they have to be taken into the budget, because they are annual expenditures although not annually appropriated; take judges! salaries.

MR. FURNESS: I think they may not be included in these figures.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, if you can tell me why you want to separate them, do so, because it will help a lot. Otherwise, I will be interrupting you.

MR. FURNESS: It is simply that I do not think that those figures in the left-hand column represent the total of the expenditures and, therefore, do not show a true proportion.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, he does not know, so you will have to give that evidence later, Major.

BY MR. FURNESS: (Continued)

Q Now, in addition to the annual budget--THE PRESIDENT: Well, we will ask him.

I understand that it is questioned whether you do or do not know whether those special funds,

.

those monies secured against consolidated revenue, are or are not included in the budget item, in the total budget figures given by you. We should clear it up once for all time, and save time.

THE WITNESS: To the best of my information, these are included in the total budgets that are reappropriated each year.

What I think you want, Major Furness, is how much of the total budget each year was actually expended.

MR. FURNESS: If it runs from year to year I am not particularly interested in it.

THE PRESIDENT: I - s the 19,000,000 for 1941 represent actual expenditure in that year?

THE WITNESS: It represents the amount available for expenditure in that year under appropriations.

THE PRESIDENT: Have you the figures showing actual expenditure over those years?

THE WITNESS: I do not have those figures.

Q Now, Mr. Liebert, from what date of the year to what date does the fiscal year in Japan run?

A The fiscal year begins April 1, ends March 31.

Q Of the calendar year, for example, April 1, 1941 to March 31, 1942, would represent the fiscal year 1941?

A That is right.

Q That is correct?

A That is correct.

Q So that your figure, total budget for the fiscal year 1941, and total of war and navy budgets, represents a period which includes four months, approximately four months, after Japan was involved in the Pacific War?

A Correct.

Q And the total of war and navy budgets include supplemental budgets and appropriations during that period, which represent funds for the prosecution of the war already in existence, rather than preparation for war?

A I don't recall any supplementary appropriations or supplemental appropriations after war was commenced in December 1941 which would apply to the total figures of the budget as expressed herein.

Q Would you say, then, that there were no supplemental budget bills or appropriations made -- appropriation bills passed immediately after the declaration of war?

A Well, you always have supplemental appropriations passed by the Liet. I might refer you to page 15 of document 854, which shows a supplemental

budget of the 76th Diet of 47,000,000 yen, the ordinary expenses under the jurisdiction of the War Ministry. But you will note from the preceding pages that this is not out of line at all. This is not anything but normal.

Q Did you say document 854, or exhibit 854?

- A Exhibit 854.
  - Q Don't you mean --
  - A The budget.
  - Q --exhibit 859?

A I thought it was given a moment ago as 854. It is the budget, the one we are talking about.

Q It is document 9023-A, which I think is exhibit 859.

A Thank you.

Q Now, I suggest that you refer to another page of that exhibit, namely, page 4, and look at the figures there under excess of a budget. Are not all the figures subsequent to December 6, 1941, appropriations in excess of the budget after war was declared?

When I say in excess of the budget, I mean in excess of the annual budget which was passed at the end of the preceding fiscal year; in other words, before March 31, 1941.

19 20

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

21

22 23

24

March 1942?

A Do I take it that you mean that the funds of the budget were exhausted in December 7, and more money was appropriated as a furtherance of the war effort after that date, between December 7, '41, and

Q Yes, that is exactly what I mean.

A Well, I think you will find on the same page, page 4, what you call "excess of a budget" was an authorized expenditure of 90,000,000 yen on November 5, 1941, which appears as the last figure in that column of "Excess over Budget."

Q I find that.

A I can't tell from this reference whether that is an excess expenditure or whether that is a reserve left over unexpended.

Q Well, there are many that much larger figures subsequent to December 8, 1941. Lo not those represent money which was appropriated in order to finance a war in existence, rather than any preparation for war or national defense?

A No, I don't think so. This simply represents money already appropriated that was expended. The fact that the war happened or commenced in Lecember 7 had nothing to do with the original appropriation for conduct of war in the sense that you mean.

11

12

1

2

3

4

8

9

10

11

13 14

15 16

17

19 20

21

23 24

The figures on that page -- apparently they refer in part to the 77th Diet and 78th Diet. Do not they represent supplemental appropriations, supplemental budget, passed by them?

A Oh, no, no. These were releases of money or authorizations to expend money from the extraordinary war expenditures account.

If you will note on page 1, the budget for the Ministry of War is broken down into two -- into three accounts, the general account, war expenditure account, and special accounts. According to the note, the special accounts mostly duplicate the general account and/or the war expenditure account, and, therefore, have been eliminated from the total. These things have to do with the maintenance of arsenals, woolen plants, shoe factories, and many things which the army owns as incidental to the work of carrying on an army.

THE PRESIDENT: I think we fully appreciate your point, Major, that a large part of that 17,000,000 for 1941 would have represented actual expenditure on the war itself. Likewise, the 15,000,000 which was appropriated for the army and the navy.

MR. FURNESS: That was exactly what I wanted

to bring out. If the Tribunal is satisfied, I am.

THE PRESIDENT: I said we see your point,

and I con't think you can make it any clearer by

continuing to ask questions of this witness, because

he doesn't know.

Wolf & Spratt

Q Have you also in later, subsequent pages of your report given figures on the raising of funds through national loan bonds and other means? These include, do they not, funds raised for the fiscal year 1941, including a period of four months during which Japan was at war?

A Total national fund amounts to include the fiscal year were expressed as of 1941, which would bake into consideration bonds which might have been sold after December 7, 1937 until March 1941.

Q And the same would be true of other tables and figures in your entire report and supporting papers which refer to the fiscal year 1941?

A With the fiscal year, as expressed in relation to government matters and government tables, it would include a small fraction in the beginning of the year 1942.

Q And about a twelfth of the year 1941, the fraction being about one-third of a year?

A That is correct.

Q Now, the budgets for the years 1937, 1938,1939 and 1940 are years in which Japan was deeply involved in the China incident, were they not?

A That is a fact.

Q And in considering your report and the

supporting figures, we should take into account that they represent expenditures which include that?

A These figures reflect that period of time and must necessarily include whatever was done during those years by the government.

MR. FURNESS: Thank you.

MR. FUJII: I am counsel FUJII.

THE PRESIDENT: Counsel FUJII.

CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)

#### BY MR. FUJII:

Q Looking at the proof of your statement, paragraphs one and two, I find that you divide Japan's economy into peacetime economy and wartime economy.

When do you consider that Japan entered wartime economy?

THE PRESIDENT: Did you mean anything more than military operations? Answer me.

THE WITNESS: Yes, I did. I think the commencement of preparations for war might date back to February 1936, at least in the financial field. We see the commencement of industrial activity which I would class as general preparation of industry, which, if not directed for the purpose of preparing for war, certainly was very useful in the light of subsequent events, most particularly when we find an admission of plans for the preparation of industry and the making of war back as

early as 1936, according to Mr. SATO.

Q Do you admit that the year 1936 was the year in which the final Japanese Incident was in progress and nobody knew when that incident will be terminated?

- A 1936?
- Q In 1937.
- A 1937 was the date of the China Incident.
- Q Then, as Mr. Furness asked you sometime ago in exhibit 842 and in related documents, whenever you refer to a year you always mean the financial year -- fiscal year -- which begins on April 1 and ends an March 31 of the following year; is that not so?

A Yes.

Therefore, when you stated in your prepared statement that plans for the expansion of production were -- that a plan for the expansion of production -- to be completed by 1941 was expressed, that meant that that plan was to be completed by March 1941; is that not so?

THE MONITOR: March 1942, fiscal year.

A I would assume sa, although it is not definitely expressed in the plan. It says the end of the year.

Q And also, are you aware that there are some commodities whose production -- some plants which were

2

1

5

6

Q

9

11

10

12

14

15

17

18

20

21

22

23 24

2

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

not expected to be completed by the end of the fiscal year 1941, that is, which would continue even into 1942?

THE MONITOR: Even after March 1942.

Well, I can't express a conclusion as to whether the plans as set forth by the Planning Board mean these plants will be completed by March 1942 or by the end of the year 1941. They are simply set out in terms of years. We usually, for business purposes however, consider the end of a production year as December 31 of that year, but I have no way of knowing whether the plans as set forth here mean the end of a fiscal year or a production year. I expect that they would mean the end of a production year so far as the building up of an industry is concerned.

THE PRESIDENT: My colleague points out to me that the army Five-Year Plan was to be completed by the end of the 1941 fiscal year. See page 3 of exhibit 841.

We will recess for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1045 a recess was taken until 1100, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

Yelden & Goldberg

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed. THE PRESIDENT: Counsel FUJII.

BY MR. FUJII (Continued):

O The President asked you a question just before the recess --

THE PRESIDENT: Better stand or put somebody at the lectern.

Q (Continuing): In order to make sure of this point I would like to ask you again. In your prepared statement and also in exhibit 842, A Plan for the Expansion in Production of Major Industries, the verious years referred to in those statements, do not all these years, for instance, 1937, 1938, 1941, and so forth, mean the fiscal year, that is, from April 1 to March 31 of the next year?

THE PRESIDENT: He said so already, unless
I grossly misunderstood him twice.

On In paragraph 60 of your prepared statement you stated that the outlining of the plan for the expansion of productive power specifically set goals to be reached by the end of 1941. Does that mean that the goal was set specifically to attain these plans by the end of the year 1941?

THE MONITOR: In other words, December 31, 1941,

is that what you mean?

A I think -- I mean by the end of December, 1941, or the end of the year for production purpose. We speak in the plan -- all of those plans referred to except the outline of the five-year plan for the production of war materials which was referred to as document 9002, or exhibit 841 --

To get the thought straight: Ill of the plans except exhibit 841 refer to the end of the year generally; 841 is the only plan which says "by the end of the fiscal year."

C Then I shall understand it to be so.

Then in paragraph 34 of your prepared statement concerning alcohol, do you admit that the Japanese Government announced a seven-year program concerning the production of alcohol in 1936?

A Yes, to read from the statement: "In 1936 the Japanese Government announced a seven-year program whereby production of Japan proper would be increased to 39,000,000 gallons a year by 1941."

That was part of the program.

Next, paragraph 25 of your prepared statement, the production of synthetic petroleum, do not these plans call for the -- was not the goal of this plan intended to be reached in 1943?

2

1

5

4

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

7

8

6

9 10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24 25

THE MONITOR: By the end of 1943?

Yes, the plan referred to in paragraph 25, but that is a plan for the development of production in Menchuria. That is a separate plan entirely.

- But according to your prepared statement, do you not say that plans for Manchuria mean practically the same thing as plans for Japan itself?
- That is true, but I have broken this statement down to distinguish between productions in Manchuria and productions in Japan, and speak generally of productions for Japan in preparation for war at other places. We have to be both general and specific.
- Then you do not take the view that concerning the production of synthetic petroleum, plans for Manchuria would mean the same thing as plans for Japan?

THE MONITOR: Slight addition: Plans for Japan means plans for Manchuria, which, in turn, means plans for Japan; isn't that your view? Don't you take that view?

Yes, plans for production in Manchuria would contribute to the benefit of Japan as in its rounded economy because it controlled the Menchurian production. Here, where I have referred to plans for Japan, I mean plans for Japan proper: and when I have referred to plans for Manchuria, I mean plans for

I have later on shown how the production of synthetic petroleum from shale oil in Manchuria did not necessarily reflect to the benefit of Japan proper because it was used in Manchuria.

Then do you agree that the plans for the increase in production of alcohol or plans for the increase in production of synthetic petroleum both called for the attainment of their goals in years later than March 31, 1942, in your prepared statement, exhibit 842?

THE MONITOR: In other words, examples or plans which are scheduled to be completed after Merch, 1942?

A The Japanese plan for the production of alcohol had a goal of 1941. I assume that to be the end of 1941 in the absence of any information which I have seen referring to it as the fiscal year. The plan for the production of synthetic petroleum from shale oil in Manchuria had a goal, 1943.

MR. FUJII: I feel that the witness has not made sufficient investigations on this point, but I will not question him further on this point.

q "hat do you mean when you use the term "expansion of productive power" in your prepared

•4

statement?

Expansion of industrial potential, expansion of the ability to produce.

On Then, specifically, do you not meen the establishment of factories, the installation of machines, the expansion of electric power, and so forth?

A I do mean that, and I --

Q Then are you aware that many of the plans for the production -- for an expansion in productive power, concerning which you have testified in your prepared statement, relied on materials from abroad as their basis?

A That is true, but --

Q Then do you know that, for instance, bauxite which is used in making aluminum was to be imported from the South Seas, that copper ore was to be imported from Canada, North America and South America, and that lead ore was to be imported from Australia and South America?

A Yes, and I also know that it was because of the failure of certain of these imports that Japan did not meet certain of her rlanned production schedules. But, I would like to request, Mr. Attorney, that in considering this we must distinguish carefully between

1 2

4

3

6

8

10

11

13

14

15 16

17

19

20

21

22

24

· CROSS

plans for building factories and plants for the expansion of production and actual plans to achieve production from indigenous sources.

Is it not true then, that, for instance, in the production of aluminum, in the drafting of plans for an increase in production of aluminum, copper and lead, a prerequisite for the accomplishment of these plans was that imports from abroad should not be stopped?

THE MONITOR: In other words, were those plans made -- or expansion plans made on the supposition that as far as the supply of aluminum, copper and lead ores are concerned, supplies from abroad would not be cut?

No. Let me explain. The plans for increasing production, as I have outlined in the essentials of the five-year plan and other plans, is to increase the productive capacity of Japan, Manchuria and China, as a unit so that this unity would not be dependent upon outside countries or outside sources for their materials. The plans of the Planning Board to achieve certain production during the years involved, which I have not cited here but have referred to, show a reliance upon imports to achieve the specific production, to further other plans for total production of the end

è

products.

According to Pert III of exhibit 842, prosecution document 1522, which is a summery of program for extension of productive capacity prepared by the Planning Board, January, 1939, the goal set for the production of aluminum in one year, in 1941, was 126,400 metric tons; that of copper was 179,000 tons; and that of lead was 35,550 metric tons. Do you believe that when this plan was drafted, it was intended that it would be completed relying solely on the natural resources of Japan, Manchuria and China?

A Yes, when it was drafted, it was intended to increase the indigenous production.

Greenberg & Ber

. 25

of natural resources -- of these resources, from South
Ascrice and from Australia, in other words, from
countries outside of Japan, Manchuria and China, were
not included in this plan?

A That is correct. This plan was made -- if I might refer you to the paragraph sub 3, of major paragraph 1 on page 1, this plan aims at the establishment of self-sufficiency in regard to important resources within the sphere of our influence and thereby avoid dependency upon the resources of a third power, as far as possible, in time of an emergency. It was not contemplated, Mr. Attorney, that during the period of the execution of this plan that imports of copper, lead and aluminum from other countries would be stopped. Not at all.

MR. FUJII: I hope to have an opportunity to prove my point later concerning this.

According to paragraph 9 of your prepared statement, the Manchurian Heavy Industry Development Corporation was to control the expansion of electric power -- was to control directly the expansion of electric power and electric equipment. The part of its duties were to control directly production of

power and production of installations -- equipments
of those plants and production of those installations
-- those equipments and their control. I cite this
as one example of your insufficient investigation.

THE PRESIDENT: That company and four others.

THE WITNESS: Would you repeat that?

(Whereupon, the President's statement

was read by the official court reporter.)

THE PRESIDENT: He picked out one and said
that company was to control it. There are others

mentioned besides, four at least.

BY MR. FUJII (Continued):

C. The Manchurian Heavy Industry Development

Corporation.

A Yes. The one of the purposes of the Manchurian Heavy Industry Development Corporation was to expand the power facilities. They built dams for

hydroelectric power, and that sort of thing, to expand the electric power facilities in Manchuria.

I shall cease my questioning at this point; although I believe you are mistaken.

THE PRESIDENT: Those comments are not called for and quite unusual in any Court that I am accustomed to.

3

4

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In paragraph 12 of your prepared statement you say that the Diet passed the Petroleum Control Law in 1934, et cetera, et cotora. Is it not true that in every country where the natural resources of petroleum is insufficient the government tries to insure a sufficient reserve of oil by promulgating those control laws?

A I can't tell you what happens in every country; but it did harren in Japan.

In any country where the production of petroleum is insufficient. In any country.

A I don't know what the question is, but if you mean to ask me do I know whether it is a usual practice for countries having deficiencies of petroleum to stock pile retroleum against an emergency, I don't know.

Q Although there already has been crossexamination on the organization of the Planning Board, I wish to ask you a few more questions in order to clarify this point. This concerns paragraph 100 of your prepared statement.

Is it not true that the Planning Board merely drafts laws and programs -- for instance, the program for the expansion of productive power -- and

C The .-

control associations is appointed by the

that the actual execution of these programs must first -- that in order t actually execute these programs it must first be passed by the Cabinet and then each Minister carries out that part of the program which falls within the sphere of his Ministry?

A That is correct.

You have stated in this paragraph that the president of each control association, each control organization, had to be nominated by the government. What do you mean by the "government," specifically, in this case?

A I don't mean nominated by the government.

I said nominated by the industry. I see what you mean. No, I mean selected and appointed by the industry and approved by the government. I use the word "nominate" in that sense.

THE PRESIDENT: What you said, which really doesn't matter much, was this: The system established provided that each industrial control association should nominate a president, who would be appointed by the government. Each individual control association should nominate a president, who would be appointed by the government.

The president of each of the industrial control associations is appointed by the Minister of

7 8

Commerce and Industry, and is not appointed -- and the President of the Planning Board has nothing to do with his appointment. Is that so?

A The Cabinet Ministries --

BRIGADIER QUILLIAM: May it please the Tribunal, as I have said before, I am very reluctant to interrupt in these circumstances, but I do suggest that this line of cross-examination is quite irrelevant and is an undue waste of time. I ask, therefore, that that type of question be disallowed.

THE PRESIDENT: In my country an appointment by a Minister is an appointment by the government. That is the decision of our own high court of Australia. I do not know what it would be in Japan. However, I am sure that my colleagues do not desire that point to be elaborated. The objection is upheld.

BY MR. FUJII (Continued):

fixing of production plans, the allocation of materials to individual plants to effect planned production, the nomination of sale of all products, the establishment of wage policies, and the fixing of prices within each industry, was made pursuant to the joint planning of the heads of the control associa-

tions and the Planning Board, who united policy and production.

Do you know that the allocation of these materials was not done by the joint planning of the heads of the control associations and the Planning Board, but that it was done by the order of the Minister of Commerce and Industry.

The fixing of the allocations to various plants was done within the control association. Let me illustrate. If Plant A had a capacity of so many units of production; the allocation of materials to be allowed to that plant was fixed within the association, and the conclusions of that association were passed in to the Planning Board. If it was determined within the Planning Board that the unit commodities or the end production of Plant A were to be produced 100 per cent as a matter of policy, then the allocations came as a matter of course to that plant. Since the general control of certain commodities came under the bureaus located within the Ministry of Commerce and Industry, they were notified accordingly and, I believe, rubber-stamped these allocations to clear their departments.

I insist that the Planning Board suggests laws and is not an organ for their execution.

4

7

8

10

11 12

13

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

24

THE MONITOR: Not "laws," but "plans."

A I don't wish to convey the impression that the Planning Board in itself executed, as an executive agency, specific allocations. They were a board directly under the Prime Minister, which was a coordinating agency. Advices and recommendations to the Ministers, following the policies coordinated within the Planning Board, were sent out.

Q The next paragraph, 106, of your prepared statement. Do you mean to say in this paragraph that since -- paragraph 106, "Integration of Territories" -- do you mean to say in this paragraph that, after the Japanese Army had conquered Manchuria, Bank of Chosen notes were gradually withdrawn and notes of the Central Bank of Manchuria were issued, and that the area in which the notes of the Central Bank of Manchuria should circulate was expended?

A The expansion of the note issues of the Bank of Chosen during the Manchurian campaign from 75 million yen to 222 million yen, caused an inflationary policy in Manchuria, and, of course, these notes were withdrawn from circulation. When the Central Bank of Manchoukuo was initiated as the banking organ of the puppet government, its notes

,

were put into circulation because there hadn't been any Central Bank of Manchoukuo prior to the institution of the puppet government of Manchoukuo, and these notes circulated as the medium of exchange in that territory. Prior to the institution of the Bank of Manchoukuo, the notes of the Bank of Chosen -- the Bank of Chosen issued most of the notes which circulated in Manchuria.

Q Although you say in this paragraph that the notes of the Bank of Chosen were gradually withdrawn, when we look at the chart in paragraph 149 we find that whereas, at the end of 1935, notes of the Bank of Chosen in circulation were 222 million yen, in 1936, which is the following year, there were 212 million yen, which represents a decrease of only 10 million yen. Do you admit this?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, he said there was a gradual decrease. I do not know why you are asking him that question.

We will recess now until half past one.

(Whereupon, at 1200, a recess was taken.)

Abram & Morse

## AFTERMOON SESSION

The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at 1330.

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

JOHNGRANVILLE LIEBERT, called as a witness on behalf of the prosecution, resumed the stand and testified as follows:

MR. USAMI: USAMI, appearing for the accused HIRANUMA, please.

THE PRESIDENT: Counsel USAMI.

CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)

## BY MR. USAMI:

Q Mr. Witness, I refer you to page 82 of your prepared statement. Do you have it there? Now, under the heading of "Financial Preparation" at the top of the page, paragraph 105, you state: "Under the Japanese form of totalitarian Imperialism financial controls for the years immediately preceding 1941 were designed for two purposes." First, I would like to ask you, Mr. Witness, whether this heading "Financial Preparation" is a heading or not covering the full heading "Integration of Territories"? Are they separate?

A Paragraph sub-1 of 105 says that one of the purposes designed for -- was to integrate the dependent

territories into the economic system of Japan. To make it easier reading I used the sub-heading "Integration of Territories," which relates to the very first part of paragraph 1, to integrate dependent territories.

Thank you. Will you please, Mr. Witness, tell us in preparing your statement how many years roughly did you allow to be the years immediately preceding 1941?

preparations, considered the period from 1931 to
1941. For instance, in the integration of Manchuria
I have, as expressed here, started in 1931, the Manchurian Incident," and inter-related the provisions
of the plans which I have ut into evidence as exhibits, plans which pertain to the following years,
all after 1931, with regard to Manchuria, China, and
so forth. I have, of course, made reference to Chosen,
or Korea, and Formoso, historically, to show their
position at the time further integration took place,
so that we would get the picture clearly in mind
when we discussed the final problem of financial
preparation.

Q I refer you, Mr. Witness, now to the following page, page 83 of your prepared statement, paragraph 107, please. I quote: "After the

ment was entered into, between the Imperial Japanese Government and the Imperial Government of Manchukuo which, politically as well as practically, bound the conomies of the two nations. This particular agreement, according to your answer just given, falls under No 1 of these two purposes referred to in paragraph 105, does it?

A That is correct.

I now want you to look at the document, IPS document 858A, exhibit 850. Will you please point -- which specific part of this document points to show -- I mean what specific part of this document shows that this particular agreement between Manchukuo and Japan had the purpose of No. 1 of paragraph 105?

A This agreement, which is shown in the document, provides for a joint committee presumably to exercise control over the economic matters between Japan and Manchukuo.

THE PRESIDENT: You mean a financial or economic integration?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE PRESILENT: Obviously, not a physical one.

THE WITNESS: That is exactly so, and I de
sired that this document which is dated the 17th of

-

8

10 11

12 13

14

16

17

15

18 19

20 21

22

23 24

25

July, be read in the light of a secret meeting of the Privy Council of Japan held on 3 July. The Privy Council meeting discloses, as I have shown the Tribunal, that it was never intended that this joint economic committee should in any way represent Manchuria in a fair light when any matter came up before it.

THE PRESIDENT: Perhaps you didn't even intend a political integration. Whither are we going so very slowly, counsel USAMI?

MR. USAMI: Mr. Witness, you just said -- may I proceed now?

THE PRESIDENT: I would like to know what you are trying to get at.

MR. USAMI: I hope it will be clear soon, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: It is far from clear at present.

BY MR. USAMI: (Continued)

Q You just mentioned, Mr. Witness, a secret meeting of the Privy Council, and I notice the word "secret" appears on the top of the document 875A, but it does not appear in the Japanese original.

Well, I was informed from my translation that this was a secret meeting, but it seems to me of very little importance, since the matter contained

is the part that is pertinent to the point I wish to make.

Q Did you come across, during the course of your investigation -- come across any evidence showing that these Government officials who attended this Privy Council meeting had in their mind a war as the ultimate aim of this agreement?

BRIGADIER QUILLIAM: May it please the Tribunal, in view of the ruling given by the Tribunal several times last week, I suggest that that matter is a conclusion to be drawn by the Tribunal and not by the witness.

MR. USAMI: My question does not ask the witness to draw a conclusion. I simply asked whether the witness did find documents or other sources of information to show that these government officials who participated in this agreement had in their mind a war as an ultimate aim of this agreement.

THE PRESIDENT: He knows no more about that than the documents show, and we will have to draw the inferences, as Brigadier Quilliam says, and as we have reminded you several times.

Q These two documents mentioned in your statement, paragraph 107, IPS document 2196A and 875R, are these the only documents you based your report on

4

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

regarding this agreement between Manchukuo and Japan?

A I have read many documents concerning this agreement, but I assumed that the agreement itself and the meeting of the Privy Council relating to it was the epitome of clarity on this matter.

Q Then I would like to know, if the Tribunal allows me to, whether you have read any other documents to show that the Japanese Government and Manchukuo Government had in their mind a war, a future war, in concluding this particular agreement.

THE PRESIDENT: In the absence of any answer we would conclude that he didn't see any such document, but if you want to risk an unfavorable answer you may do so.

MR. USAMI: I would like to have your answer, Mr. Witness.

tablishment of the joint economic committee, I cannot expand on the committee itself any further than the two documents I have shown here, but when we consider the plans of the Planning Board and the plans of the Japanese Ministry of War, which include plans for the development of Manchuria, I can assume with surety that under the provisions of this committee the operation of the plans was assured.

Do you remember, Mr. Witness, the date of the Q establishment of the Planning Board?

May 17, 1937.

25

Q I now turn to document 9022, at the top of page 1. It is marked "Top Secret." And on page 4, middle of the page, I quote: "Pursuant to the decision of the ministerial conference. . "

THE PRESIDENT: What is the number of the exhibit, Counsel USAMI?

MR. USAMI: 9022, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: That is the prosecution document number.

MR. USAMI: Oh, I am sorry. 852.

Q I now quote another page further on, page 17, second paragraph. I quote: "It is, therefore, desired to carry into effect the outline for the issuance of military currency notes as enclosed herein upon approval by the Prime Minister, the Minister of Finance, the War Minister and the Navy Minister."

Did you find any other documents or any source of information to show that this top secret matter was taken up by the cabinet meeting? I mean, prior to the outbreak of the Pacific War.

A Do you mean, have I seen any other documents which would indicate that this entire series of communications was made a matter of hearing or discussion before the assembled cabinet?

Well, what I want to know is if this matter

of issuance of military currency notes was discussed in the cabinet meeting or not. I mean, the essence of it.

A I cannot say. All I know concerning these secret communications is what appears in the communications themselves.

MR. USAMI: That concludes my cross-examination. Thank you, Mr. Witness.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Smith.

CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY MR. SMITH:

Q Mr. Liebert, in paragraph 28 of your report, exhibit 840, you say that Japan has a plantiful supply of coal. Were you referring to resources in coal or operating mines in Japan proper?

A I was referring to resources in Japan proper.

Q Are you swere of the fect that during the tenyear period from 1931 through 1941 that the coal production in Japan had never been able to keep up with the demand?

A Japan never had enough coking coal. That had to be imported, usually from China. The coal which we refer to generally as a supply for a normal, economy in Japan was what I had reference to, and in consideration of exports of certain low-grade coal which Japan made to the continent in exchange for other commodities.

6

7

8

1

2

3

9

11 12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

We speak of a supply of coal for normal industrial periods.

Now, during the year you indicate, or years you indicate, industrial expansion, particularly of steel, shot up tremendously, thus requiring enormous imports of coking coal and special kinds of coal. Heavy industries are not normal to the economy of Japan, because they do not relate to the natural resources. As these heavy industries expanded, it called for more and more coal and, hence, an expansion of the coal industry, the opening of new mines, and so forth.

- Q The only coal which is indigenous to Japan proper is a low-grade coal high in volatile matter, that is to say, in sulphur and other gaseous substances, and also contains non-combustible material, and a high percentage known as slate; is that right?
  - A That is substantially correct.
- Q And none of the coal indigenous to Japan proper is what is known as coking coal, is that right?
  - A That is correct.
- And the only coal which is suitable for the making of steel and iron is a coking coal, is that right?
  - A Yes, and this is usually imported.

Q Well, if all of that coking coal is imported, how would the opening of new mines in Japan proper contribute to the war potential?

A The iron and steel industry is the one which uses this high-quality coking coal, as we say; but the ordinary coal in Japan is very satisfactory for other industrial purposes requiring heat. For instance, Japan even tried to make synthetic petroleum from coal. And many war industries, so-called war industries, use coal -- other than iron and steel -- for which the coal indigenous to Japan is very satisfactory.

I think perhaps the best answer to that question is the one which is found in the plans for the stimulation of essential war production, in which coal is set out as one of the important minerals, the production of which is to be stimulated.

Q Are you familiar with the fact that the coal indigenous to Japan is used only for steam and heating purposes, and for no other purpose?

A Well, I have said they attempted to make synthetic petroleum from it, and steam and heating purposes covers just about the whole gament of uses of coal except for open-hearth or blast furnaces in the manufacture of steel.

Q Japan imported substantial quantities of

coking coal from Manchuria, North China and Indo-China during all of the ten-year period from 1931 to 1941, is that correct?

A That is correct.

Q I will give you some rough figures and see whether it tallies with your recollection. Imports from Manchuria, China, and Indo-China, 1926, '27 and annually through 1932, about 2,600,000 British long tons; that is, 2240 pounds to the ton.

A I don't recollect, but those figures are not out of proportion with what they might have imported.

Q 1936 through 1939, 4,000,000 tons annually.

Does that tally with your recollection?

A That could be substantially correct.

Q And only coking coal is suitable for the production of gas, is that right?

A It is usually simultaneous operation. You take the coke and get the gas as a residuary.

Q Are you aware of the fact that houses in Japan have been heated, in the main, by charcoal up to this time since time immemorial?

A That is correct, as far as I recall.

Q Well, I want to go back to my original question and ask you whether or not the demand for coal, that is, coal indigenous to Japan, has always exceeded

2

1

5

6

8

10

11

12

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

the supply?

A The demand for coking coal has exceeded the supply because there isn't much here in Japan. But we were talking a moment ago in terms of 2,000,000 tons of coking coal. I would like to point out the expansion plan for the production of coal in Manchuria, which is appended to exhibit 842, provides that the goal to be reached in 1941 for the production of coal in Manchuria alone was over 78,000,000 tons. I only mean to call attention to the fact that in this problem which is so enormous we have to consider proportions.

Q Isn't it a fact that after 1931 the expanding economy in Manchuria consumed within Manchuria substantially all the coal they were able to produce, outside of minor exports to Japan proper?

A Yes, great proportion of the coal mined in Manchuria was used in Manchuria because that is where a great deal of the heavy industry was being built up.

Q If Japan were shut off from coking coal in China, Indo-China and Manchuria, where else in the world could they go to get a sufficient supply of it?

A Well, we have coking coal in the United States; England has it; they have it in the Ruhr Valley; many

7 8

places in the world have coking coal. But Japan doesn't

have enough of the coking coal to supply her normal needs, particularly her expanded heavy industrial needs.

Q Well, my point is, with the exception of the coal in the Ruhr, the only other coking coal in the world was in the hands of the Allied Governments during the Pacific War, isn't that right? I am talking about operating mines, now. The Allies owned it all except what was in the Ruhr Valley, is that right?

A I am afraid I don't understand the question.

But Japan got her coal, and got her coal during the war,

from those territories which were occupied by her and

adjacent to those territories occupied by her. She

dian't get any, certainly, from the United States or

Great Britain.

Q No leading power in the world can fight a modern war without an adequate supply of coking coal, is that right?

A Well, they all have it for the iron and steel industries. I don't know whether it is possible to manufacture enough steel from the electric processes or not. But I think we can classify coal as a critical war material.

olf & yolden

O I want to go over briefly to the electric industry and ask you if by the year 1935 ninety-one per cent of all residential and industrial buildings in Japan proper were lighted by electricity?

I think that figure is reasonable.

of exhibit 840, it shows in the bottom box a fairly steady consumption of electricity for electric light and household appliances from 1935 through 1941. My question is, what is the point of your statement last week in which you, as I understood, said that the rearmament was carried on at the expense of household electricity and the ordinary people in Japan? "ould you explain that?

ment or a country spends millions -- hundreds of millions -- of yen or dollars or any monetary unit for the expansion of electric power which has such a wide distribution in the homes, for the conveniences and use of the people, that they would get some additional benefits from this expenditure.

THE PRESIDENT: Did the population increase over that period of six years?

THE WITNESS: Not sufficient, Mr. President, to make any difference in the point. I wish to illustrate.

1.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

23

24

THE PRESIDENT: With the increase in population and the increase in the number of homes you would expect an increase in the electricity.

THE WITNESS: One might also expect that with the increase of electricity available in the country that there would be more household appliances and a greater consumption of electricity by the people.

THE PRESIDENT: "as there an increase of population over those years?

THE "ITNESS: I have here the --

THE PRESIDENT: You may look at it during the recess.

BY MR. SMITH (Continued):

? Are you familiar, Mr. Liebert, with the fact that during the past, that is, for twenty years before 1941, that there was most of the time a surplus of electric power in Japan?

I don't know what you mean by a surplus of electricity in Japan, Mr. Attorney.

C "ell, ever since at least 1900 the electric power industry in Japan has been based on water power, is that right -- that is, generated from water power?

A There are normally about six months out of the year when the water flow is insufficient to carry

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

on the electrical power industry and that is made 1 up by thermal electrical units here which use mostly 2 coal in their operation. 3 I want to go on to another subject. Japan 4 has no cotton, is that right? That is correct. 6 Q At the same time it built up a large 7 textile industry for the weaving of cotton goods, 8 is that correct? 9 That is correct. 10 11 0 Japan has only negligible quantities of 12 wool? 13 That is correct. Λ 14 Japan has practically no salt which is in-15 dispensable for her as a foodstuff and also for the 16 chemical industry, particularly the making of paper; 17

is that right?

Japan imports most of her salt because it L is cheaper to do so. There are no natural salt deposits in Japan of any consequence.

Q Japan has only negligible quantities of wood pulp?

Λ No, but she preferred to import wood pulp.

Well, on the subject of wood pulp, what Japan had came from northern Sakhalin Island, is that right?

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

17

18

19

16

20 21

23

22

24 25 A It was thought better to import wood pulp and Japan was a substantial importer of wood pulp before the war. Some of it came from Sakhalin and some from other parts, a lot from Korea.

Q Prior to 1941 Japan had built up a substantial industry in rubber goods, the imports of which came mainly from the Netherlands East Indies and the Strait Settlements; is that correct?

A That is correct.

Q The iron ore found in Japan proper, also in Korea, is of an extremely low grade; is that right?

A That is correct.

Q And substantially all the iron ore was imported. Do you recall what countries it came from before 1941?

A Part of it came from China and French Indo-China.

Q Do you agree that iron and steel scrap is indispensable to steel manufacture under present conditions?

A From an industrial point of view, that is true.

C From 1931 through 1940, at which time I believe the United States embargoed the shipment of

2

3

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

scrap to Japan, Japan was a heavy importer of iron and steel scrap from the United States and India; is that correct?

- That is correct.
- In your statement you said the potential of Japan and the production of petroleum was about ten percent of her normal requirements. "hat year were you taking as a normal year in making that calculation?
- A That was an average estimate, a rough estimate I will say, of the years preceding 1934. THE PRESIDENT: "e will recess for fifteen minutes.

("hereupon, at 1445, a recess was taken until 1500, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

19 20

21

22

23 24

Goldberg & Spratt

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Smith.

BY MR. SMITH (continued):

Q Have you finished your answer, Mr. Liebert? Had you finished your answer? Well, never mind. We will go on to something else here.

During the nine years from 1931 through the oil embargo for 1940, ninety per cent of all Japan's petroleum requirements were obtained from the United States and the Dutch East Indies, is that correct?

- A That is substantially correct.
- Q Do you agree that a modern war of either defense or offense cannot be fought without petroleum?
- A I believe that is generally conceded by the militarists.
- Q Despite intensive cultivation in Japan proper and its territories and the intensive use of fertilizers, Japan has never been self-sufficient in foodstuffs, is that correct? I am referring now to the ten-year period 1931 1941.
- A Owing to deficiencies Japan proper imported foodstuffs.
- Q That was roughly about twenty per cent annually, would that be a fair average?

2

3

4

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

A That might be a little high. I would say fifteen.

Q Are you familiar with the fact that nearly all the house construction in Japan, that is the principal building material is lumber?

A That is so.

Q And during the ten-year period before 1941 Japan was a substantial importer of timber, is that correct?

A Yes, Japan imported lumber.

Q Well, they imported lumber in substantial quantities principally from Canada, is that correct?

A She imported from outside the Empire, socalled Empire, from Canada and the United States, yes; and she imported some from Manchuria, some heavy timbers from Saghalin.

Q In March 1933 the Japanese Diet passed a Foreign Exchange Control Law. Are you familiar with the fact that between 1927 and 1935 thirty-three governments in the world, because of the depression and dislocation of international trade and the necessity of marshaling and controlling foreign exchange, found it necessary to pass foreign exchange control laws?

A I recall that during that period some nations passed laws which were generally classified as foreign

15 16

17 18

19 20

21

22 23

24

exchange control.

Q Do you recall that the largest part of the world was locked up in exchange controls between 1927 and 1935? I am not talking about a few nations, but many of them.

A I think that can generally be said to be so.

Q Well, how then do you associate a natural phenomenon with the preparation for war of aggression?

A Well, I think this all comes down to the general proposition which we have discussed all through the memorandum. It must be understood that Japan had an economy, that it had to support that economy in relation to the existing economies of the other nations of the world; and that certain of the acts which the Japanese Government did closely paralleled the acts of other nations. But it is in the abnormality of the application of certain laws and the abnormality of the laws themselves which I think, when coupled with events and plans for war, must show these acts in a different light than the acts of other nations.

Q What was abnormal about the Japanese Diet passing a foreign exchange control law in the circumstances and conditions of 1933?

A In 1933, when we considered a foreign exchange control law in itself and disassociated from

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

other acts and other laws, there is nothing wrong with it; but, as I have said, the powers given were not completely invoked until January 8 in 1937. At that time we began to see a restriction of foreign exchange into certain channels, and those channels were funnels of foreign exchange into the purchase of commodities which were for the purpose of preparing heavy industry or those industries we have called war industries. We see severe restrictions on the use of foreign exchange for those commodities which we would normally consider economies good for the nation as a whole and the people, a normal use of foreign exchange. The licensed purchases which were allowed under these foreign exchange measures beuilt up artificial industries which were, in my opinion, not indigenous of Japan, nor would they naturally result in profit . to Japan. For instance, under Class A of the materials to be restricted from import, we have the leading peacetime materials, some of which you have cited, such as cotton, wool, wood pulp, wood for houses, rubber. These imports were severely curtailed from the normal levels. It was because of these facts that I felt there must be something wrong in the control policy of foreign exchange control, policy which led to an investigation which resulted in the production of this 25

23

plan for building up a war industry.

Q You said the Foreign Exchange Control Law was not fully utilized until 1937, as I understood you. Is it possible you have that law confused with a separate law which was passed by the Japanese Diet on September 10, 1937, Law No. 92 providing for export and import, temporary management law, which became necessary after large-scale fighting broke out in China?

A No, I haven't confused the two laws. The Foreign Exchange Control Law provided for the control of foreign exchange as such, and the temporary control of imports and exports law was set up to create an import licensing system. There was thus a sort of two-headed control over imports: one, the licensing of the money to be purchased, for an exchange to be purchased; and another was a direct licensing of commodities which might be brought in after the exchange had been purchased.

Q Law No. 92 of September 10, 1937 was a temporary wartime expedient. Is that right?

A It was indicated that it was such when the law was passed, but it became very permanent and, to the best of my knowledge, is still in existence.

Q At the time Law No. 92 of September 10, 1937

2 3 4

7 8

was passed, it contained a provision that the powers granted should cease within one year after the termination of the China Incident, is that correct?

- A It contained that provision.
- Q Now the Foreign Exchange Control Law of 1933 was a peacetime expedient, is that correct?

A I would say that it could be considered as such by itself, but in these laws we must consider the application of them later on where their existence made it most convenient later on to apply these laws for a different purpose.

e 2 n 3 e 4 g 5 & 6 E 7 e 8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

On that when Japan built her refineries, especially cracking plants, she located them in out of the way points, and you say that was significant. Would you tell us where those points are that the main refineries were built?

A Those refineries were built along the west coast of Japan, so they would be available to the imports of crude from the East Indies. I recall reading, I can not at the moment recall the exact place, that these plants were dispersed by the orders of the Army and the Navy. However, I have a chart in my office showing the location from an air plot, of these various refineries. I can't name the cities at the moment. I am sorry.

Well, all of the imports of crude from the East Indies came into ports on the west side of Japan proper. Is that correct? I mean in the normal course of business.

A That is the information I have, as my recollection serves mg.

And these refineries were built right near the ports of unloading. Is that right?

A They were built generally on the west coast.

What is the point of your statement that

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

14

16

17 18

19

21

23

24

it was significant that they were located in out of the way points? I don't quite understand what is out of the way about that, when they were built near the port of unloading.

A It is my intention in using that choice of words -- merely that those plants were built at the direction, as I was given to understand, of the Army and the Navy, and were so located that they would be protected as much as possible from observation and from possible attack.

And you make that last statement although Japan proper at its widest point is only 250 miles wide.

THE PRESIDENT: "Out of the way" is a relative term, of course, always.

Q (Continuing): Bearing on your statement that you and others took 1931 as your normal average year in Japan, I would like to read a statement to you and have you answer whether it is correct, or substantially correct. "The year 1929 was a turning point in Japan foreign trade, which entered a period of severe depression affecting both exports and imports. The removal of the gold embargo led to an over-valued condition of Japanese currency, which the government endeavored to overcome by a policy of consistent

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

deflation. The result of foreign trade in 1931 showed a decrease of about 47 percent in exports and of over 44 percent in imports compared with 1929, the total value of exports and imports declining by nearly 2 million yen in comparison with 1929. The main cause of the sharp decline in the trade of 1931 was the extraordinary recession in prices, which averaged about 45 percent compared with the year 1929, whilst the volume was only about 3 percent less and, indeed, showed an increase over the figure of 1930." Is that statement substantially correct?

I think we can say that statement is substantially correct.

Well, do you still adhere to your answer that 1931 should legitimately be considered as a normal year for your figures?

THE PRESIDENT: Based on production or prices, which? It makes all the difference.

Q I meant to say both, Your Honor, both on production and prices. You can answer that question in two parts: first, production, and secondly, prices.

Well, for an answer to that question, you can't dissociate them, for you have to consider them both together.

2

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

THE PRESIDENT: You have been talking about productivity, and, according to the statement read to you by counsel, there has been very small reduction, if any, in that.

MR. SMITH: Well, Your Honor, what I read is only one part of what I intended to read to him. It was such a lengthy quotation I storred there. But there is more to this picture. I would like to get him to answer on what I have already said.

THE WITNESS: As I have said before, I have selected the year 1931 for several reasons. It is an arbitrary date; number 1; number 2, it follows a period of reorganization, let us say, Japan going completely off the gold standard to effect reorganizations in her internal economy. It is a year that allows Japan to make certain adjustments in her foreign trade relations because of that going off the gold standard; at the same time, I think it begins & pickup after the world-wide depression, which is indicative of many things, particularly a good place to begin a survey. And I think we must also consider again that the word "normal," or what we consider normal, is a relative term, to be used by many people in different senses when we consider a problem of this scope.

24

23

Another reason why I have called it a normal year is because I do not feel that there is, so far as I can see, any evidence that Japan began an industrial preparation for war in a general sense before 1936. I think it was important that we give a survey of what happened for the few years preceding that date, so the Tribunal could make up its own mind on these matters. I think we can say that in 1931, at least by the end of 1931, beginning of 1932, the depression was over in Japan.

Q I wanted to ask you if it is not a fact that Japan did not begin to rull out of its economic depression until late in 1932.

A Well, again, that is relative, Mr. Attorney.

It will differ a great deal among writers or among what you or I see as evidence.

Well, it makes a radical difference when you talk about reduction figures in prices, I mean a lapse of a whole year, doesn't it, and during conditions such as existed during the depression?

A Well, as I have shown you this morning, the retail prices remained relatively constant from 1931 on up to about 1935. This is indicative of a certain normalcy or a certain balance, on the charts which I have shown you, or production charts, et cetera. I think you can begin any place from 1931 up to '41 and see those advances in productivity. Some in the early years, if you wish to consider it so, may be considered normal increases for an expanding economy coming out of a depression. But, in the light of the admittedly national defense legislation and the plans dating back to 1937, we must reconsider the end of productive activity, and we see a new element, the element of stimulation of certain classes of industries at the expense of the others, namely, the

7 8

advance of the war and war-supporting industries at the expense of the peace industries. We have to consider all of these elements in making any kind of a statement of this sort.

Q I'd like to get back to whether 1931 was a normal year and read to you further and ask you whether it is a correct statement. Referring to the decrease in exports and imports, I am reading now: "Industry was severely affected by this shrinkage, and conditions were aggravated by the decline in demestic purchasing power on account of the depressed state of Japanese agriculture." Is that correct?

A So far as it goes, I think those statements by themselves can be taken as reasonably correct.

Q Throughout your report, exhibit 840, you called attention to the dearth in Japan of strategie and critical materials which were needed for the fighting of a modern war, and the effort of Japan to become self sufficient in those strategic and critical materials -- all of them would have been necessary if Japan had been engaged in a war of self-defense, is that right?

A The same materials are materials -- war materials whether it is a war for self-defense or a

war of offense. That's true.

Q Well, if the same preparation would have been necessary irrespective of whether it was a war of defense or offense, why, throughout your report, do you describe these preparations as acts of aggression tying into a war machine and a totalitarian scheme?

A I think I referred to them as war preparations and war potential and war industries. I don't think I ever stated that this preparation was in preparation for aggressive warfare. Those are conclusions for other people.

Q When you began your work on this report about six months ago, you were told that you were to prepare -- in substance, you were told that you were to prepare an economic report showing Japan's aggressive designs, is that right?

A No, that's not exactly correct. I was asked to prepare a statement concerning the economic and industrial and financial preparation for war on the basis of facts as I found them, and I was to put them in the statement which you have here.

Q Are we to understand that you entered upon this work with the idea of making an impartial representation of all the facts which had a bearing on

the position of Japan in its preparation?

A I was asked to prepare the statement. And if I found, on the basis of the facts as I saw them, that these indicated --

MR. SMITH: I think, your Honor, with one more question I can terminate this examination.

I understand I am the last counsel.

A (Continuing) If these facts indicated preparation for war, I was to include them in the statement, which I have done. I came to the conclusion that there was a preparation for war, and that has tempered my statement here. I think it is inescapable.

THE PRESIDENT: Was there any substantial increase in Japan's population during the five years before 1941?

THE WITNESS: The last figure, Mr. President, that is disclosed in the Japan Year Book of 1942 was the year 1938. I have totaled the figures by myself from the years 1932 to 1938 which show an increase in population of approximately six and one-quarter million.

MR. SMITH: Your Honor, that is all I have to ask. But, since I spoke, I understand from Mr. Logan that maybe one additional counsel will

cross-examine tomorrow morning. THE PRESIDENT: We will adjourn now until half past nine tomorrow morning. (Whereupon, at 1603, an adjourn-ment was taken until Tuesday, 29 October 1946, at 0930.)